



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/982,070	10/17/2001	Joerg Jahnke	30014200-1009	7274
58328 7590 10/18/2007 SUN MICROSYSTEMS C/O SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP P.O. BOX 061080 WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080			EXAMINER TANG, KENNETH	
			ART UNIT 2195	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/18/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/982,070

Applicant(s)

JAHNKE; JOERG

Examiner

Kenneth Tang

Art Unit

2195

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/31/07.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1-4,6,7,9,11-14,16,17,19,21-26,30,31,33-36,38,39,41,43-46,48,49,51,53-58,62 and 63.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims rejected are 1-4,6,7,9,11-14,16,17,19,21-26,30,31,33-36,38,39,41,43-46,48,49,51,53-58,62 and 63.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the Amendment on 7/31/07.
2. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and were not found to be persuasive.
3. Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9, 11-14, 16-17, 19, 21-26, 30-31, 33-36, 38-39, 41, 43-46, 48-49, 51, 53-58, 62-63 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9, 11-14, 16-17, 19, 21-26, 30-31, 33-36, 38-39, 41, 43-46, 48-49, 51, 53-58, 62-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Bowman-Amuah (US 6,842,906 B1) in view of Kennelly et al. (hereinafter Kennelly) (US 6,559,861 B1).**

5. As to claim 1, Bowman-Amuah teaches a computer-implemented method in a data processing system for providing resources adapted to at least one of a plurality of user environments (dictionary language pattern environment, etc.) (*col. 4, lines 55-58, col. 38, lines 60-67 through col. 39, lines 1-10*), the method comprising the steps of:

initiating execution (operation) of a program, the session object and a resource identifier that is associated with a plurality of resource data stored in the session object; and while the

Art Unit: 2195

program is executing, determining from the session object which of the plurality of user environments the program is executing in (done by the unique identity of identifier) (*col. 283, lines 48-67, col. 284, lines 1-10*); and

6. Bowman-Amuah teaches identifying which of the resource data is suitable for the determined user environment because the identifier identifies what is suitable. Bowman-Amuah fails to explicitly teach that the determination of the user environment is done by both the resource identifier and the determined user environment and having a session/application object for a user session with the program and resource identifier.

7. However, Kennelly teaches an object associated with a user session which requires login from a user name and password for user environments based on resource identifiers and languages (such as English, French, Japanese, etc.) (*col. 1, lines 9-67, claim 1, col. 9, lines 4-11, col. 3, lines 44-54*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the feature of the determination of the user environment being done by both the resource identifier and the determined user environment to Bowman-Amuah's data processing system, using identifiers addresses and objects to determine various types of services because this would provide the user with the ability to use the program in multiple languages (*col. 1, lines 6-9*).

In addition, Bowman-Amuah (*col. 192, lines 13-28*) and Kennelly (*col. 2, lines 62-67 through col. 3, lines 1-32, see Abstract*) teaches wherein the step of identifying which of the resource data is suitable comprises: loading a lookup object for linking the resource identifier with the resource data suitable for the determined user environment; and obtaining the suitable

Art Unit: 2195

resource data from the lookup object by using the resource identifier and the determined user environment.

Finally, Bowman-Amuah (*col. 283, lines 65-67 through col. 284, lines 1-10 and lines 48-55*) and Kennelly (*col. 2, lines 62-67 through col. 3, lines 1-32, see Abstract*) teaches wherein the resource data comprises: step of obtaining the suitable generating a string identifier comprising the resource identifier and the user environment; and obtaining the suitable resource data using the generated string identifier, wherein the lookup object includes a link between the string identifier and the suitable resource data.

8. As to claim 2, Bowman-Amuah teaches wherein the determined user environment identifies a location of a user of the program (location of the global addresses) (see Abstract). Kennelly teaches identifying by a geographical location (*col. 1, lines 9-21, etc.*).

9. As to claim 3, Kennelly teaches wherein the determined user environment identifies a language (such as English, French, Japanese, etc.) of a user of the program (*col. 1, lines 9-67, claim 1, col. 9, lines 4-11, col. 3, lines 44-54*).

10. As to claim 4, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, the broadest reasonable interpretation of the received resource data is satisfied in Bowman-Amuah by its object (*col. 283, lines 48-67, col. 284, lines 1-10*).

Art Unit: 2195

11. As to claim 6, Bowman-Amuah teaches wherein a number of users are using the data processing system; and wherein at least one lookup object is loaded for each user (*col. 140, lines 49-67 through col. 141, lines 1-12*).

12. As to claim 7, Bowman-Amuah teaches wherein a number of users are using the data processing system; and wherein at least one lookup object is loaded for a plurality of users (*col. 140, lines 49-67 through col. 141, lines 1-12*).

13. As to claim 9, Bowman-Amuah teaches wherein the step of obtaining the suitable resource data comprises: invoking a dictionary function to obtain one of a plurality of lookup objects corresponding to the determined user environment and that link the resource identifier with the suitable resource data (*dictionary, Fig. 58, 62, or 63*).

14. As to claims 11-14, 16-17, and 19, they are rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-7, and 9.

15. As to claim 21, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, it is inherent that the data processing computer system contains a processing unit (CPU) and memory.

16. As to claim 22, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 4.

Art Unit: 2195

17. As to claim 23, Bowman-Amuah teaches wherein the resource data comprise a string of at least one character (*col. 283, lines 65-67 through col. 284, lines 1-10 and lines 48-55*).

18. As to claim 24, Bowman-Amuah teaches wherein the resource data comprise a resource function including rules for character representation (*col. 283, lines 65-67 through col. 284, lines 1-10 and lines 48-55*).

19. As to claim 25, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 2.

20. As to claim 26, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 3.

21. As to claim 30, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 9.

22. As to claim 31, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1.

23. As to claims 33-36, and 38-39, and 41, they are rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-7, and 9.

24. As to claims 43-46, 48-49, and 51, they are rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-7, and 9.

Art Unit: 2195

25. As to claims 53, 55-58, and 62, they are rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claims 21-26, and 30.

26. As to claim 63, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1.

Response to Arguments

27. During patent examination, the pending claims must be “given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.” *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969).

28. *On page 15 of the Remarks, Applicant argues that Bowman-Amuah does not teach or suggest generating a string identifier comprising a resource identifier and a user environment.*

A rejection based on 35 USC 103 was made with two references. Kennelly teaches this limitation in view of Bowman-Amuah (see Kennelly, col. 2, lines 62-67 through col. 3, lines 1-32, see Abstract). In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth Tang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3772. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 6:00PM, Every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2195

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kt

10/14/07


MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINE
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2195